The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. X. ST. LOUIS, MO., NOVEMBER 12, 1903. NO. 43.

THE QUESTION OF "CATHOLIC FREE SCHOOLS."

I.

THE Rt. Rev. Bishop Shanahan, of Harrisburg, who distinguished himself before his elevation to the episcopacy by his intelligent and successful administration of the important office of diocesan School Superintendent in Philadelphia, is quoted as follows in favor of Catholic free schools, so-called, by the *Catholic Columbian* (No. 39):

"I believe that the great need, at the present time, is free schools for our Catholic children. In many parts of the country the pupils are required to pay, in school, a certain fixed sum, weekly or monthly, for their education. This regulation keeps many children out of our Catholic schools, and it throws the whole burden of maintaining the school upon the parents of the pupils who attend it. Now, a parochial school is an essential part of a well-regulated parish, and the duty of supporting it devolves on the community—on all the members of the parish alike. Pastors will sometimes say in extenuation that none are excluded from the school. This may be; but we all know that our people have a horror of being placed in a pauper class, and will generally send their children to a public school, when they can not afford to pay the required tuition at the Catholic school. In some parishes, parochial academies are conducted for the children of the wealthy; the parochial school is free and is known as 'the poor school,' and is maintained from the income of the academy.*) This arrangement is calculated to beget odious castes in a parish and to keep the children of the poor always in a separate stratum or section of society. The parochial school should be first-class in every re-

*) These must be rare cases; we know of none.

spect, better than the best academy, and free to all. The teachers should not be obliged to collect money for tuition; the children should not be asked for money in school; the cost of maintaining the school should come from pew rents, monthly collections in church, or from other sources of revenue."

Our readers need not be reminded that Bishop Shanahan's above-quoted views have been repeatedly advocated in THE REVIEW.

II.

Having given, on various occasions, the arguments generally adduced in favor of making our parochial schools "free," either by taxation or endowment, we wish to-day to give room to the chief objections that have been raised against the plan by zealous priests and laymen.

The strongest statement which we have seen of these objections, so far as they apply to the question of taxing all the members of a parish for the support of the school, came to our notice recently in a Minnesota weekly, edited by Catholics, *Der Nordstern* of St. Cloud (No. 40).

The argument, says the writer (evidently a priest), that a parochial school is "an essential part of a well-regulated parish," can not be sustained. The parochial school is no essential part of a parish, but an "annexum ecclesiae," as it used to be called, an annex, which, it must be confessed, in this country under present conditions, is morally necessary.

The duty of educating children is first of all incumbent upon the parents. To fulfill it more easily and successfully, a number of families unite, and we have a school. Or private teachers open schools and receive the children. The Church in such cases does not claim the right of property, but only a certain control. The reason we have church schools in this country is because the two ways described above are not feasible here. Thus our schools become parochial schools and a morally necessary annex to the church.

The question whether the Church can tax her members for the support of parochial schools, as she taxes them for the support of churches, must be answered in the negative, because all the faithful need churches, but not all need schools. Unmarried parishioners and married people who are childless, are not obliged to contribute to the education of the children of other members of the parish. Hence the Church can not tax them for the support of the school. Now, as there are a number of poor people in nearly every parish who can not afford to pay school money, there arises for the remaining members the duty—a duty of charity—to aid the poor; and where that duty is neglected or

where the proceeds from this source are insufficient, the Church must appeal to the wealthy or supply the deficit from her own means.

Thus are our Catholic parochial schools usually supported : by the school money from those parents who can afford to pay, and by special collections and contributions from the general parish fund. It would, no doubt, be easy enough for the pastor to add the school-tax to the pew-rent ; but would it be just?

We are told that free parochial schools will wipe out the class distinction between rich and poor. It is doubtful if that would be an advantage. The difference is there, and we can not efface it. The only question can be : Is it better for the children to be made aware of the existing inequality, early at school, or later in life? Is there not danger, if they learn it later, that they will feel it all the more keenly and conceive a lifelong hatred against the well-to-do?

The existence of free State schools can not be adduced as an argument to prove the necessity of free parochial schools. If the Church has no right to tax her members for the support of schools, neither has the State. And we suppose every well-instructed Catholic knows that the modern State has usurped a right which does not belong to it, by taking the education of youth into its own hands and taxing the citizens promiscuously for the support of common schools. It is a fact we can not change, but we should not expect the Church to follow a bad example and likewise become a usurper.

If it is feared that Catholics may, in course of time, grow tired of paying school money (in addition to the school tax levied upon them as citizens for the benefit of the State schools), and send their children to the "public schools," we will not say that this apprehension is unfounded ; but it is no reason why we should tax those of the faithful who are not in justice taxable, for the support of our parochial schools. The Church must appeal all the more urgently to the conscience of parents who have children and the charity of those who are childless. Beyond that, she can not go, and experience has shown that it is the only way, and the only correct way, to support the parochial schools in good times and in bad.

III.

On the question : Would it be advisable to endow our parochial schools, so that they would become entirely free? this writer does not express himself.

But this question also has been answered negatively by clergymen whose opinion is not without weight. Thus our esteemed

friend Father Decker, of Milwaukee, in several contributions to the *Katholischer Westen* and the *Luxemburger Gazette*, has opposed the endowment plan on the ground that it would tend to stamp out the spirit of sacrifice among Catholics, which has built up our parishes and dioceses, and upon which the Church's support for the future depends. This spirit of sacrifice, he says, is already much diminished in the younger generation of American Catholics; if, besides, we lift from their shoulders the burden of providing for the Christian education of their children, they will gradually cease to contribute and to appreciate the benefits of church and school, which can not be outweighed even by the liberal contributions their elders were wont to made.

IV.

We should like to have these objections thoroughly discussed by some of the zealous advocates of either the taxation or the endowment plan. The subject of "Education" or "Our Schools" is one for which we have always room to spare in THE REVIEW.

We note that such an eminent authority as Father Charles Coppens, S. J., takes the ground ('Systematic Study of the Catholic Religion,' p. 334) that the support of religion enjoined in the fifth commandment of the Church, comprises generally "the erection, equipment, and maintenance of schools for the religious education of the young;" and that the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore not only directs (No. 202) that "*much zeal and prudence should be employed to eradicate from the minds of the laity the notion that care of the schools concerns only those parents who directly and actually make use of those schools;*" but that they should also be taught to look upon the parochial schools as "*quasi partem essentialem parochiae*," to be always ready to contribute to their support, and to make them as far as possible "*free schools*" (the Council employs the English phrase, in brackets.)

There may be exceptional cases where the rule "quieta non movere" should obtain. An instant comes to mind from Kansas. In discussing this very question, a pastor of a country mission said to the writer: "I have not a single family that is not willing or that is unable to pay the school money. All my families own their quarter section of land and readily make a living. Why should I change the rule here? Happy parish! If there be more such cases we should exclude them from our discussion. "Eines schickt sich nicht fuer alle," said the German poet. However, they form the exception, not the rule.

Now as to the arguments of the *Nordstern* writer. He is opposed to the expression, "the Catholic school is an *essential* part of the parish." The Council of Baltimore says "quasi-essential";

we should prefer "integral." A man with one leg or no legs is still a man; nothing essential is missing, but he lacks integrity. So we may have a parish—parishioners and a parish priest are sufficient to constitute a parish—if it lacks a church or school, or both, it is still a parish; but integral? No one would call it so. It is short of both legs if it has neither church nor school. If there is no school but only a church, it lacks one leg. And similar to a man thus crippled, such a parish can not perform its task under modern conditions as it ought to. It may be even impossible to preserve the life of a parish without a school. We could point out more than one instance to that effect. There is a parish not far from St. Louis, where twenty years ago the greater number of the parishioners consisted of immigrants from Europe. These are mostly dead now. Their children, raised in the public schools without sufficient religious instruction, are still Catholics, but scarcely pratice their religion. Seventeen years ago, a parochial school was started in the place, and to-day the main attendance at church comes from the young people who were raised in the school. Were these no better than their parents, that church might be locked for good, or at any rate, an occasional visit by a missionary would suffice.

What the *Nordstern* writer tells us of the origin of schools, has only a grain of truth in it. Despite the duty of parents to educate their children, in many localities either no schools or inefficient schools would be found. Admitting the necessity of a proper education of all its citizens, the State is bound to come to the rescue. It must supply the insufficiency of the parents in providing proper schools; hence its right to levy school taxes. That right is not denied to the State. (Cf. the answer given by Fathers Hollaind and Conway to Bouquillon's query, "Education, to Whom Does it Belong"? passim. Cf. also Taparelli, 'Saggio teoretico di dritto naturale,' vol. I., nos. 914 sq.)

As the writer argues from the non-existence of such a right in the State to the non-existence of the same right in the Church, it follows that if his premises are wrong, his conclusion falls.

Furthermore, as a perfect society, the Church has the right to impose taxes for schools, when necessary. In doing so she is no "usurper." The priest, however, who would attempt to impose such a law on his parish would be a usurper, since he is no law-giver. He may persuade his parishioners of the correctness and expediency of his views, but he can not impose them as a law. He will fare best if he allows his parishioners a certain liberty. As an example, we may cite again the above mentioned parish. The Council of Baltimore had made it obligatory on all parishes with resident priest to have a parochial school. The parishioners in this

case were mostly opposed. The school building was erected by the generosity of a few. School money could not be charged if there was to be any attendance. Yet the school needed support. The pastor announced that thereafter all Sunday collections would go towards the support of the school. Till then that collection had averaged about a dollar per Sunday, soon afterwards it doubled, and to-day, though not quite, is nearly sufficient to pay the teacher. The balance is made up by fairs or house collections.

The third reason adduced against "Catholic free schools" is class distinction. The writer finds it more expedient that the children learn of its existence in school than that they should make the discovery later in life. That argument is insignificant. The very rich have always had and now have their select schools, into which no "plebeian" is allowed to set his foot. The remainder have little objection to mixing the children, provided cleanliness is properly observed.

Father Decker is afraid that the spirit of sacrifice might suffer; he sees it already disappearing rapidly. To say the least, that argument is weak. The money required to secure free schools opens up a channel for the spirit of sacrifice that neither the present nor the next generation will fill. And if after two generations our schools would be practically endowed, would there be no field left for generosity? Besides maintaining church and pastor, are there no general Catholic needs towards which the generosity of Catholics might be directed? What about the missions among the Indians and Negroes and to non-Catholics? What about the Holy Childhood and Propagation of the Faith, where American Catholics have hitherto made such a poor showing? What about the Peter Claver societies for the suppression of slavery? What—last not least—about the need of a Catholic daily press?

It seems to us there is no cause for uneasiness on this score. We are far from having sufficient endowments for our schools, and when we have obtained them, a vast field will still be open to cultivate the spirit of sacrifice, a spirit decidedly more Catholic than the one so largely prevailing at present, which embraces only the petty interests within the shadow of the parish steeple.

LIFE INSURANCE FOR CATHOLIC WOMEN.

Our enquiry in a previous number: "Why should women insure?" has brought no response. Yet according to the insurance reports of New York and Pennsylvania, a large number of Catholic women must be interested in that subject, and for their benefit we give here the figures of the three women's societies named in said reports for the business year 1902.

The total income, compared with expenditures for management (expenses), was as follows:

	Income.	Expenses.	Per cent.
Catholic Women's Benevolent Legion. (Established 1889.)	$118,415,64	$ 8,537.51	over 7%.
Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Asso'n. (Established 1890.)	$576,277.31	$ 52,866.95	" 9%.
Women's Catholic Order of Foresters (Established 1891.)	$457,072.99	$ 56,005.71	" 12%.
Total, -	$1,151,765.94	$117,410.17	

showing an expense account of over 10% for every dollar received on the average.

Each of the three concerns has a different expense ratio. This furnishes one argument in favor of our proposition, frequently advocated, to have but one large society instead of so many small ones for ostensibly the same purpose, since in that way the expense figure to income could be materially reduced.

The financial ability of the management is illustrated by the interest income for the money handled during the year and accumulated for reserve surplus. For the 31st of December, 1902, the reports show:

	Assets.	Interest Income during 1902.	Per cent.
Catholic Women's Benevolent Legion.	$110,361.76	$2,871.68	$2\frac{6}{10}$%.
Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Asso'n.	$239,683.23	5,228.70	over 2%.
Women's Catholic Order of Foresters.	$172,585.52	1,282.09	about $\frac{7}{10}$%.
Total, -	$522,630.51	$9,382.47	

In other words, a total capital of $522,630 produced $9,382.47 for interest in a year, about one and eight-tenths per cent. Since regular life insurance companies must earn at least 4% a year on their reserves in order to remain solvent, the interest account alone of

these "ladies'" insurance companies should be sufficient to justify grave doubts regarding their stability.

From the assets here mentioned, the unpaid losses on Dec. 31st, 1902, must be deducted, which are for the—

Catholic Women's Benevolent Legion, - -	$ 9,500.00
Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, - -	107,283.33
Women's Catholic Order of Foresters, - - -	57,550,00
Total, - -	$174,333.33
The aggregate assets were, - - -	522,630.51
Leaving, - -	$348,297.18

To protect outstanding contracts per 31st Dec., 1902, as follows:

	Members.	Insurance.
Catholic Women's Benevolent Legion, -	12,153	$ 8,816,750
Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, -	77,895	69,100,000
Women's Catholic Order of Foresters, -	37,913	40,747,000
Total, -	127,961	$118,663,750

In other words, for over 118 millions outstanding insurance there is $348,297.18 cash on hand after over 10 years' business activity. That means on an average $2.72 per head or $2.94 per $1,000!!!

It should be said here that the report of the Women's Catholic Order of Foresters is not very clear. The Pennsylvania report shows under "assets" for cash on hand and in bank $172,582.52, and right under it, headed "accrued interest," $40,000. Nothing indicates what these figures are for, that is, where or for what said interest is paid, and pending further information we have dropped this item, which would change the averages but little, from the above comparison.

These three concerns are all conducted on the assessment plan, which has proved to be utterly unreliable. Here are over 100,000 Catholic women, paying over a million dollars a year, under the erronous impression that their "insurance" of over 118 million dollars will ultimately be paid. True, the members must finally die, some sooner, some later; but those who will live longer than the next few years will find out to their sorrow that "there was a mistake somewhere." What effect such a discovery will have on the female membership of Catholic societies is difficult to predict. Beneficial for society life or for religion it will not be, and since there is no good reason for the majority of women to take any insurance at all, we respectfully suggest to the parties concerned to again consider our proposition: "Why should Catholic women insure?" and act accordingly.

SOME CURRENT OBJECTIONS AGAINST PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS REFUTED.

The *Pastoralblatt* recently (No. 8) published a sketch for a sermon intended to refute the objections commonly raised against our parochial schools. We think we shall do our readers a service by adapting and Englishing it for THE REVIEW.

Some parents neglect or refuse to send their children to the parochial school, as their sacred duty commands them to do. They allege:

1. The Catholic school buildings are too poor and inconspicuous compared to the large, roomy, and healthy public schools.

R. Such is indeed often the case; but there is a good reason for it. The State has more means than we Catholics, who largely belong to the poorer classes. Our schools are not palatial, but they fulfil their object, and that is the main thing.

It is not the clothes which make a man. Jesus Himself did not disdain the lowly stable at Bethlehem and the modest cottage at Nazareth.

2. We live too far away from school; the roads are bad, the streets dangerous.

R. This circumstance, if true as alleged, may excuse the non-attendance of small children, but it will rarely excuse the larger boys and girls. To do good always requires some effort and sacrifice.

3. The Catholic teachers are not so capable as those in the public schools.

R. The public schools may have some excellent teachers; the State has money enough to employ such. But we know that many public school teachers are poorly trained and incompetent. It is equally true that we have in our parochial schools, besides some mediocre teachers, others who are capable and excellently equipped. How could it be otherwise? Catholic teachers as a rule have embraced the teaching profession out of their own free will and because they felt themselves called thereto; they make it their life-work, for which they have prepared themselves by study, prayer, pious exercises, etc. They enjoy, moreover, the steady encouragement and guidance of prudent and experienced superiors.

4. The teachers are often partial; poor children whose parents can not pay, are neglected and set back.

R. That is an unjust accusation. As Christ loved the poor as dearly, if not more dearly, than the rich, so do Christian priests and teachers love poor children with the same, and often with a greater affection, than the children of the great and wealthy.

5. Catholic teachers are too rough; the school-mams are more refined.

R. Catholic teachers are stricter in their treatment of misbehaving children, because they know it is their duty and feel that they have the support of Catholic parents in correcting and training their offspring. The public school teachers largely lack this motive; besides they are in many instances forbidden by law to inflict punishment where it is well deserved and the welfare of the child would require it. Many of them are careless and would rather let an errant child go unpunished than run the risk of loss of time or trouble.

6. Catholic school children are ill-bred; those in the public schools have much better manners.

R. No doubt there are ill-bred children in every Catholic school; but you will find them in the public schools as well. Public school children often insult priests and nuns on the street and misbehave themselves flagrantly. How can it be otherwise, when they are not taught to respect God, religion, or authority?

7. Religion is about the only thing taught in the Catholic school.

R. It is true that religion holds a very important place in the curriculum of every Catholic parochial school. However, so long as the other branches are not neglected, but taught as thoroughly as in the public school, surely no Catholic has any reason to object.

8. The Catholic schools are not patriotic enough; they produce an ultramontane rather than American spirit.

R. The Catholic citizens who have been educated in our parochial schools, are as truly patriotic as those raised in the public schools. They may not make quite so much noise and are less conspicuous in the scramble for offices, but they make their living honestly and are ready to take up arms for their fatherland if need be. It is a fact that no religious denomination is so well represented in the American army and navy as the Catholic.

9. The children have to rise too early in order to get to mass; it is more convenient to send them to the public school.

R. That which is the most convenient, is not always the best. On the contrary, it is of great advantage if children are trained to rise early and attend mass regularly. It strengthens them physically and teaches them order.

10. The Catholic school costs much money, the public school is free.

It is indeed hard and unjust on the part of the State to compel Catholic parents, who pay their public school taxes like the rest of their fellow-citizens, to go down into their pockets once more in order to erect and support schools to which they can send their children without fear of religious and moral shipwreck. But it is

the duty of every good Catholic to make the best of the situation, to make the necessary sacrifices in order to insure to his children the inestimable blessing of a good Christian education. Do your duty as Christian parents; raise your children in the fear of God and in the love of your holy faith, so that they may grow up an honor to yourselves, to our holy Church and our common country, and that you may receive the reward of faithful servants in a good conscience here below and eternal bliss in Heaven.

MORE ABOUT THE PAGAN ORIGIN OF AMERICAN FREEMASONRY.

We could rest here, were our purpose in this study of Masonic ritual mere demonstration; but since it is something more, since it is also a manifestation of the inwardness of Masonry, allow us to complete our quotations about the pagan religious rite of circumambulation, the "pregnant evidence" of Masonry's descent from paganism.

"The reason assigned for the ceremony in the modern lectures of Webb and Cross," says Mackey's Masonic Ritualist, "is absolutely beneath criticism. The lodge represents the world; the three principal officers represent the sun in his three principal positions at rising, at meridian, and at setting. This circumambulation, therefore, alludes to the apparent course of the solar orb through three points around the world. This is with us its astronomical symbolism. But its intellectual symbolism is that the circumambulation and the obstructions at various points, refer to the labors and difficulties of the student in his progress from intellectual darkness or ignorance to intellectual light or Truth."

Our author has given us the astronomical and intellectual interpretations of the rite, but he has said nothing of the moral interpretation. He has told us that "circumambulare" is the same as "lustrare," to purify, to wander about; but he has not told us that his friend Plautus uses a kindred form, "lustrari," which means to frequent houses of ill-fame; for "lustrum" means a brothel as well as a purification. Pagan purifications and Christian have quite different meanings, for in paganism prostitution was even a religious rite. Hence in spite of all its talk about purity and purifications, we find invariably in paganism and the pagan mysteries, a moral corruption consisting in the deification of the sensual passions of man. This was their ultimate aim and scope, veil it as they would.

"Sun worship," says the same author in his Masonic Encyclopaedia, p. 766, "was introduced into the mysteries, not as a material

idolatry, but as a means of expressing an idea of restoration to life from death, drawn from the daily reappearance in the east of the solar orb after its mighty disappearance in the west. To the sun also as the regenerator and vivifier of all things is the phallic worship which made a prominent part of the mysteries to be attributed. From the Mithraic initiations, in which sun worship played so important a part, the Gnostics derived many of their symbols. These again exercised their influence over the mediaeval Freemasons. Thus it is that the sun has become so prominent in the Masonic system; not, of course, as an object of worship, but purely as a symbol, the interpretation of which presents itself in many different ways."

Remark well, dear reader, the unvarying genealogy claimed for itself by American Masonry in its standard works: the modern institution born of mediaeval Masonry, born of the Gnostics, born of the Mithraic or similar mysteries, born of Sabaism or primitive sun worship, in all of which phallic worship or the worship of the generative faculties of man played a prominent part. Shall we find the same in Masonry? We must naturally expect to do so, if the heart's blood and spirit of modern Masonry and the ancient pagan mysteries are the same; if, as we are told, the difference is one merely of external form. Let us, however, delay our answer a little, that we may call attention to an expression or two of our author and introduce some passages that may help to illustrate our subject.

In Mackey's Ritualist the sun is called "the most wonderful work of the Grand Architect of the Universe," and in the passage just quoted it is styled "the regenerator and vivifier of all things. It is, moreover, always spoken of personified; is never called *it*, but always *he*. Now such constant personification may, in English, be understood in poetry, in which personification is perfectly in place; but in prose, especially in plain ritualistic prose, no sensible, much less educated man would use it except for a purpose. And how is it that the material sun, "the source of material light," is the noblest work in the universe? What of the soul of man? What of the world of spirit? Life, and intellect, and free will? Does Masonry hold that even these are the product of the sun's material light, "the regenerator and vivifier of all things"? Is this the nature and essence of the human soul that we are to learn from Masonry? If its expressions are to be taken as they stand, we must answer all these questions affirmatively; that we are "the children of light" in its most material sense; if the assertions of Masonry are to taken differently, then should it have spoken otherwise. As, however, we hope to deal with this question more fully elsewhere, we are satisfied for the present to call attention to the prominence of the sun in the Masonic system.

MINOR TOPICS.

An English Bishop on the Reform of Church Music.—The new Bishop of Salford, Msgr. Casartelli, in a recent pastoral letter bearing on the reform of Church music, lays bare the many abuses that now obtain in churches everywhere. We quote from his letter :—

It has been stated that when our Holy Father Pope Pius X., after his elevation to the papacy, first met the Maestro Perosi, he greeted him with the words: "Faremo della buona musica" ("We will produce good music"). And His Holiness is credited with an intention to prosecute with vigor at no distant date the much-needed reform of sacred music. This will be a day for which many, both clergy and laity, have long been anxiously looking. The "signs of the times" seem really to indicate that ecclesiastical musical reform will be one of the chief features of the early twentieth century, just as ecclesiastical architecture reform was of the early and middle nineteenth.

It is a matter of general comment and regret that so much of our Church music is still of such a theatrical style, unworthy of the house of God. High Mass and benediction, especially on great feast days, are too often turned into little better than concerts, where people go "to hear the music" and (as they admit) find it impossible to pray.

Many masses are objectionable owing to the unmeaning repetition of the words of the sacred liturgy, which is surely a serious violation of both the respect due to these sublime utterances and the obedience due to the decrees of the Church. And in any case, the excessive length of many masses is much to be deprecated. Apart from musical considerations, these long masses are exceedingly trying to the celebrant, particularly as in this country the custom prevails of having the sermon at the sung mass; and sometimes a priest in a single-handed mission, who has to rise early, say two masses and preach, is kept to a very late hour without food, under severe physical strain. Such a custom is a fruitful source of ill-health and frequently leads to ultimate breakdown of the health of the clergy.

We earnestly exhort all the clergy and laity to join us in an attempt to reform these abuses by introducing simple devotional masses, which shall aid devotion instead of distracting it, and which have little or no repetitions and are distinguished by brevity. In order to commence some such reform, without attempting any too drastic measures, we direct that on all occasions when we are invited to assist at high mass or benediction in any church of the Diocese a program of the music shall be submitted to us one week beforehand, and that no music shall be rendered in our presence of which we disapprove. In order to guide us in these matters we have appointed a small committee of experts, clergy and laity, to whom we shall refer from time to time.

We need only refer to the decrees of synods, provincial and diocesan, as well as to the decisions of Roman Congregations forbidding female solos and the advertising of the names of soloists and other singers and performers, all of which decrees are in full

vigor. We also strongly deprecate the reports so frequently seen in our newspapers of masses and other liturgical services which read too often like critiques of concerts. On the other hand we warmly applaud the excellent custom, which has several times been tried with success, of training the boys of our elementary schools to sing simple Gregorian masses when full male choirs are not available. It is astonishing how excellently such schoolboys' choirs can be trained to sing the divine liturgy, and what is more, a constant supply of fresh young voices is available year by year, and at little or no cost.

The Clergy of the Future.—The cheerful optimist always finds in Archbishop Ireland's utterances new reasons for being content with the present and confident of the future. Thus, in his remarks this week, he has made us see that the Church in this country is about to be reinforced by a clergy who really know something. The thing has been under consideration for some time. At last it has reached the fruition-period. For five years the seminaries have been engaged in work which entitles their graduates to consider themselves educated men—that is, men of the "new" education. Pope Pius X., it is said, is in favor of the movement and under such august auspices we may confidently expect a clergy as well educated, as broadly cultured as are the clergy of Rome.

Meanwhile, the Catholic University of Washington is contributing its share to this most meritorious work. All its efforts, or rather its principal efforts, are devoted to the higher education of the clergy, to supplementing the work of the seminaries. The University has apparently narrowed its scope, and, instead of seeking wider fields, it is now cultivating the field of clerical education with might and main. It needs money for this, and the country at large is expected to supply some seventy thousand annually by means of collections.....

There may be those who will not fancy the sweeping inference from the Archbishop's words, that our clergy up to this have been of little account intellectually. But this is a detail; and there can be no doubt that our solicitude for the higher education of the clergy of the future should outweigh all pettiness of view or feeling. To be lumped in a mass of ignoramuses will not affect a sensible man—that is, if he has a sense of humor—as much as will the prospect of affording better opportunities to his successors attract him.

Of no man is it more true to say than of a priest that he is a servant. His life subserves the Church interests. He is an incident in the great work of the Church, forgotten when he is gone, cherished when he is at hand for the station that he holds and not for himself. He is most completely a priest when he can do his work best. That work is various and in some respects changes with times and countries. The administration of the sacraments, of course, is everywhere and always the same. But in this country now-a-days, priests are supposed to be business men and collectors of money. Elsewhere they are supposed to be teachers.

The time is coming, we take it from the words of the Archbishop of St. Paul's, when our priests in order to do their work well, will have to be experts in the knowledge of the day, what-

ever that means. The older generation of the clergy will have gone its way, the church-building money-raising priests—the brick and mortar priests as one enthusiastic prelate used to call us—and then will come the better-equipped, the thought-compelling, the widely read young priests for whom we shall have done our best to raise this seventy thousand a year.

They shall be welcome when they come, and may they do credit to their Alma Mater in the day of their advent. Already the trumpets flare and the heralds, with the voice of fifty men, bid us acclaim their coming. Let us make haste to level up the rough roads with the necessary contributions.—Rev. Cornelius Clifford in the *Providence Visitor* (No. 1.)

The Distribution of the Various Religious Denominations Over the Globe has been the subject of numerous and widely differing estimates. Rev. H. A. Krose, S. J., in the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (fasc. 6 and 7 of the current vol.) gives the results of laborious compilations which he has made upon the basis of official census reports and from other reliable sources. He figures that of the 1537 millions of human beings now living upon the earth, 549,017,000 (=35.7 per cent.) are Christians, 202,048,000 (=13.1 per cent.) Mohammedans, and 11,037,000 (=0.7 per cent.) Jews. Hence there are in all 762,012,000 monotheists, or, in other words, one-half of twentieth-century humanity believe in one God. Among the polytheistic religions, Confucianism, with its 235,000,000 adherents, holds first place. Then comes Brahmanism with 120,000,000, then Taoism with 32 and Shintoism with 17 millions. Buddhism, which has been numerically overestimated, counts 120,000,000 followers, while the so-called ancient Hindoo cults have 12,000,000. Besides, there are some 195,000,000 fetichists and other unclassified pagans. The rest of humanity, two to three millions, profess some "free" religion or no faith at all.

Of the Christian denominations, Catholicism is by far the most numerous, comprising as it does 264,506,000 adherents, =48.2 per cent. of the entire number of professed Christians. It is the most widely spread and the most numerous of all the religions of the world. The number of Protestants, that is to say, all Christians who are neither Catholics nor schismatics, is 166,627,000. There are 109,147,000 "orthodox" Greeks, 2,173,000 Russian heretics and dissidents, and 6,555,000 Oriental schismatics.

As the sources from which P. Krose has derived the bulk of his statistics are from five to ten years old, he concludes that the number of Catholics to-day must be at least 270,000,000.

We smile at the story of the defaulter who pleaded that, though he was short in his accounts, his heart always beat warmly for the old flag; but that is the principle upon which we condone a good many things that call for rebuke and penalty. It is natural enough in estimating a man's character to set off the good qualities against the bad, and strike a sort of moral balance which determines the verdict. But what are the qualities that we are setting over against undoubted violations of the laws of justice and righteousness? For the most part they are not moral qualities at all. They are "smartness" and the ability to make money; and if a man flings a percentage of his profits to philanthropy, he raises

an effective barrier against any criticism of his purposes or methods, and very likely he has secured a practical endorsement of them.

The *Casket* [No. 32] deploringly observes that "there is a strong movement among some people backwards towards paganism. Emblems of sensuality are tossed about everywhere. Not even a new chocolate, a new bicycle, or any new article of trade or commerce can be put on the market to-day without a flaring chromo of a half-dressed or immodestly dressed woman being flaunted on a printed page in shop-windows to catch the eye. When a manufacturer wishes to bring some article before the public, he publishes with it a half-nude female portrait. The magazines and papers which make largest claims to respectability,—many of them,—lend themselves to advertisers of this kind. We suppose they are paid for it; and it is wonderful what a good substitute for decency and honor is formed by cash, with some people."

"The historian of the Catholic Church in the United States is still to come. The numerous works of Gilmary Shea contain a wealth of material, which is, however, unfortunately not digested; while Bishop O'Gorman's manual is little more than an extract from Shea, a series of loosely connected sketches, in which the literature of the subject is not properly used."

Our older readers know that this has always been the judgment of THE REVIEW, but we can repeat it to-day in the words of a competent scholar, P. Athanasius Zimmermann, S. J. (Die Universitäten in den Vereinigten Staaten Amerikas. Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte. Herder 1896. Page 64, n.)

When the late Archbishop Zardetti resigned the see of Bucharest, Roumania, he was severely rebuked for his lack of courage and endurance even by some of his friends. We note from *La Vérité Française* (Oct. 4th) that another Roumanian Bishop, Msgr. Jacquet, of Jassy, has also found it impossible to continue his episcopal labors. It appears that, in his zeal to follow out the policy of conciliation prescribed by Leo XIII. towards the schismatic Catholics so numerous in that region, Msgr. Jacquet went farther than the Prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Gotti, thought permissible; whereupon he decided to relinquish his difficile office.

A correspondent writes: "I have consulted a canonist on the question of the exclusion of married priests from the sacred ministry among the Ruthenians and other Orientals living in the United States. He sends me three decrees dated respectively 1890, 1892, 1897, enforcing or confirming the exclusion of such priests. It would seem, therefore, that the decree of exclusion has not been rescinded by the Holy See. At least there are no documents to be found permitting the ministry of married priests in this country."

But how is it, then, that there are a dozen or more of them exercising the sacred ministry here?